

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,050	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167416.2/40062.152USU1	7044

27488 7590 10/07/2004  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

BAUTISTA, XIOMARA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/015,050

**Applicant(s)**

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

X L Bautista

**Art Unit**

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/22/02, 12/4/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The attempt to incorporate cross-references into this application by reference to "titled \_\_\_\_\_" and "Serial Number \_\_\_\_\_" (pages 1-2) is improper because complete information about related applications must be provided.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-4, 10-12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al* (US 5,471,399) and *Devine et al* (US 6,631,402 B1).**

#### Claims 1 and 17:

Tanaka discloses a network management system and method for determining the visual arrangement of workspaces in a network management graphical user interface. Tanaka does not teach a first zone operable to display tools and a second zone operable to display workspaces and modules. However, Devine discloses an interface for web based reporting service for customers requesting information located at remote back-end intranet servers of telecommunications service entities (abstract;

col. 1, lines 13-17; col. 2, lines 12-33). Devine teaches an explorer tool in a first zone displaying a list of workspaces having a name associated with each workspace (figs. 4, 6, 8, 9b-9h; col. 4, lines 57-62; col. 5, lines 37-39; col. 20, lines 26-35). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tanaka's management method to include Devine's teaching of an explorer tool because it provides easy and fast navigation; a wide range of information or tools at a glance on a single screen; information can be viewed on one part of the screen, click on an object and get detailed information or the content associated with the selected object displayed on another part of the screen; no need to click back through multiple screens to find the selectable objects again.

Claims 2-4, 10:

See claim 1. Devine teaches visual indication (highlight) of object selection (figs. 9b-9h).

Claim 11:

Tanaka/Devine teaches that when an object in the left side is selected a workspace associated with the selected object is displayed (controlling position) in the right side of the interface (figs. 9b-9h).

Claim 12:

Devine teaches a scroll bar (fig. 9d).

4. **Claims 5-9 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka/Devine* and *Alimpich et al* (US 6,344,859 B1).**

Claims 5, 8, 9, 18, and 19:

Tanaka/Devine does not teach a drop-down menu. However, Alimpich discloses a data processing controlled display system having a graphical user interface that has network interface control functions (drop-down menus) that extend when selected.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Alimpich's teaching of drop-down menus in

Tanaka/Devine's interface because the container can have a large number of options without taking too much space.

Claims 6, 20, and 21:

See claim 2. See further: Devine, figs. 9b-9h.

Claim 7:

Devine teaches an edit element (fig. 9a).

5. **Claims 13-16 and 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka/Devine* and *Lindhorst et al* (US 6,337,696 B1).**

Claims 13-16 and 22-32:

See claim 4. Tanaka/Devine does not teach an object pane and a task pane. However, Lindhorst discloses a user interface having an event pane, action pane, and code pane. Lindhorst teaches graphical representations of objects, events and

actions displayed in a plurality of regions (figs. 1 & 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of invention to include an object pane and a task pane in Tanaka/Devine because the user is presented with windows having boundaries and containing different objects or functions, which enables the user to easily locate and select a desired option.

Claims 27, 28 and 32:

Devine teaches a property sheet (figs. 9a-9h).

Claims 29 and 30:

Devine teaches indication of multiple selected objects (fig. 9c).

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to X L Bautista whose telephone number is (703) 305-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-18:00), Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2179

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

***PTO Move Information***

9. The Patent and Trademark Office will be moving to Carlyle in October 2004 (October 12<sup>th</sup> through October 28<sup>th</sup>). The Examiner's new telephone number will be (571) 272-4132; The Examiner's SPE new telephone number will be (571) 272-4136; and the Technology Center Main Telephone Number will be (571) 272-2100.



X L Bautista  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2179

xlh  
30 September 2004